

# The Gazette of India

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

---

No 47] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1952

---

## PART II—Section 3

**Statutory Rules and Orders issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and Central Authorities (other than the Chief Commissioners).**

### MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

*New Delhi, the 18th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1907.**—The following amendments to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Police Regulations made with effect from the 20th May 1952, partly by the Central Government and partly by the Inspector General of Police of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands in exercise of the Powers respectively conferred on them by the Police Act, 1861 (V of 1861), are hereby notified for general information:—

In Table 'C' under Appendix 2.2 of Chapter II of the said Regulations after item (2) the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

“(3) Free quarters to all members of Wireless Section whose families are with them, or in lieu, house rent allowance on the following scales:—

Pay between Rs. 80 and Rs. 119—Rs. 10 p.m.

Pay between Rs. 120 and Rs. 249—Rs. 15 p.m.

Pay between Rs. 250 and above—Rs. 20 p.m.

[No. 45/9/52-AN.]

E. C. GAYNOR, Dy. Secy.

---

### MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

*New Delhi, the 15th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1998.**—*Corrigendum.*—In this Ministry's Notification, S.R.O. 766, dated the 22nd April, 1952, published on pages 710 to 739 of the *Gazette of India*, Part II—Section 3, dated the 3rd May, 1952, as corrected by S.R.O. 1621, dated the 18th September, 1952, on page 721, in the list showing the names of countries, under B, for “Nicargua” read “Nicaragua”.

[No. 6(8)-EFII/52.]

S. S. SHIRALKAR, Dy. Secy.

*New Delhi, the 17th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1909.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 52 of the Banking Companies Act, 1949 (X of 1949), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendments shall be made in the Banking Companies Rules, 1949, the same having been previously published as required by sub-section (3) of the said section, namely:—

In the said Rules—

1. In rule 1 after sub-rule (1), the following sub-rule shall be inserted, namely:—

“(1A) They extend to the whole of India except the State of Jammu and Kashmir”.

2. In sub-rule (1) of rule 2, after clause (e), the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

“(f) ‘commencement of these rules’ means—

(i) in the case of merged territories in Part A States, the States of Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore-Cochin, Bhopal, Manipur and Tripura and those parts of the State of Rajasthan which formerly comprised the Indian States of Jaipur, Bikaner, Jaisalmer and Jodhpur, such date or dates as the Central Government may by notification in the Official Gazette specify in this behalf.

(ii) in any other case, the 26th day of March 1949”.

[No. D.6037-F.I/52.]

**S.R.O. 1910.**—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (i) of clause (f) of sub-rule (1) of rule 2 of the Banking Companies Rules, 1949, the Central Government hereby specifies the 22nd November 1952 as the date on which the said Rules shall come into force in the areas referred to in the said sub-clause.

[No. D.6750-F.I/52.]

S. K. SEN, Dy. Secy.

## MINISTRY OF FINANCE (REVENUE DIVISION)

HEADQUARTERS ESTABLISHMENT

*New Delhi, the 12th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1911.**—The following notification by the Income-tax Investigation Commission is published for general information:—

### “NOTIFICATION

It is notified for general information that the Income-tax authority mentioned in column (1) of the table attached to this notice has been authorised with effect from the date mentioned in column (2) thereof by the Income-tax Investigation Commission, without prejudice to his regular duties, to be authorised Official under section 6 of the Taxation on Income (Investigation Commission) Act, 1947, and that under the provisions of the said Act, any person (including a person whose case is not under investigation) who is required by the said authorised official in the course of the investigation—

- (1) to produce accounts or documents; and/or
- (2) to give information in respect of such accounts or documents; and/or
- (3) to attend in person and answer questions on oath; and/or
- (4) to make or prepare statements on oath giving information on specified matters;

shall be bound to comply with his requirements notwithstanding anything in any law to the contrary. Failure to comply with the requirements of the said authorised official may amount to an offence under Chapter X of the Indian Penal Code.

Name and designation of the Authorised Official	Date from which authorised	Address of the Head-quarters office of the Authorised Official
1	2	3
Mr. K. Raha, Income-tax Officer, Kanpur.	28-10-52	Income-tax Office, Kanpur

(Sd.) H. S. RAMASWAMI, Secy.  
Income-tax Investigation Commission."

NEW DELHI;  
3-11-52

[No. 64.]

N. D. MEHROTRA, Dy. Secy.

#### CENTRAL EXCISE

New Delhi, the 19th November 1952

**S.R.O. 1912.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Rule 8 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, the Central Government hereby exempts tea waste consisting of "Red Stalk" or "Stalky Tea" or "Floor and Machine Sweepings" or "Fluff", from the whole of the duty leviable thereon.

[No. 26]

E. S. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Joint Secy.

#### CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE

##### INCOME TAX

New Delhi, the 10th November 1952

**S.R.O. 1913.**—In pursuance of sub-section (4) of Section 5 of the Indian Income Tax Act, 1922 (XI of 1922), the Central Board of Revenue directs that the following further amendment shall be made in its Notification No. 32—Income-tax, dated the 9th November, 1946, namely:—

In the Schedule appended to the said Notification under the Sub-head 'VIIA Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Bilaspur, Patiala and East Punjab States Union' for the Ranges and Income-tax Circles mentioned against them, the following Ranges and Income-tax Circles shall be substituted, namely:

##### Rohtak

1. Rohtak.
2. Hissar.
3. Karnal.
4. Special Survey Circle, Patiala, (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of the Income-tax Circles specified in entries 1 to 3).

##### Patiala

1. Patiala.
2. Bhatinda.
3. Special Survey Circle, Patiala, (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of the Income-tax Circles specified in entries 1 and 2).

*Ambala*

- 1 Ambala
- 2 Salary Circle, Simla
- 3 Simla
- 4 Sangrur
- 5 Special Survey Circle, Patiala, (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of the Income-tax Circles specified in entries 6 and 7)
- 6 Ludhiana
- 7 Ferozepore
- 8 Special Survey Circle, Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of the Income-tax Circles specified in entries 6 and 7)

*Amritsar*

- 1 Amritsar
- 2 Gurdaspur
- 3 Hoshiarpur
- 4 Jullundur.
- 5 Special Survey Circle Amritsar (in respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of the Income-tax Circles specified in entries 1 to 4)

2 Where an Income-tax Circle or ward stands transferred by this notification from one Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax to another appeals arising out of assessments made in that income-tax circle or ward and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Circle or ward from whose jurisdiction that Income-tax Circle or ward is transferred shall on and from the date of this notification be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Circle or Ward to whom the said Circle or Ward is transferred

[No 79 ]

K B DEB, Under Secy

**MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY***New Delhi, the 12th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1914.—Corrigendum**—In this Ministry's Notification No SC(A)-4(15), dated the 2nd July 1952, published as S.R.O. 1149 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 dated the 5th July 1952, for "Iron and Steel Control of production and Distribution) Order, 1941" and "No SC(4)-4(15)" occurring in the first paragraph thereof "Iron and Steel (Control of Production and Distribution) Order, 1941" and "No SC(A)-4(15)" respectively should be substituted

[No SC(A)-4(15) ]

*New Delhi the 19th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1915.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (a) of Clause 2 of the Iron and Steel (Control of Production and Distribution) Order, 1941 the Central Government is pleased to authorise the Steel Controller Government of Madhya Pradesh to exercise the powers of the Controller under Clause 11-D of the said Order within the State of Madhya Pradesh

[No SC(A)-4(32) ]

**S.R.O. 1916**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (b) of Clause 2 of the Iron and Steel (Control of Production and Distribution) Order, 1941 the Central Government is pleased to authorise the Steel Controller Government of Madhya Pradesh to exercise the powers of the Controller under Clause 5-C of the said Order, within the State of Madhya Pradesh

[No SC(A)-4(32)A ]

**S.R.O. 1917.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (a) of Clause 2 of the Iron and Steel (Control of Production and Distribution) Order, 1941, the Central Government is pleased to direct that the following amendment shall be made in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry and Supply, No. I(I)-4(41), dated the 7th September 1950, as amended from time to time, namely:—

To the Schedule annexed to the said Notification, the following entry shall be added, namely:—

“Chief Executive Officers of Janapada Sabhas in Madhya Pradesh.”

[No. SC(A)-4(107).I]

**S.R.O. 1918.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (b) of Clause 2 of the Iron and Steel (Scrap Control) Order, 1943, the Central Government is pleased to direct that the following amendment shall be made in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry and Supply, No. I(I)-4(78)A, dated the 6th January 1951, as amended from time to time, namely:—

To the Schedule annexed to the said Notification, the following entry shall be added, namely:—

“Chief Executive Officers of Janapada Sabhas in Madhya Pradesh.”

[No. SC(A)-4(107)A.]

D. HEJMADI, Under Secy.

*Bombay, the 12th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1919.**—In pursuance of sub-clause (1) of clause 3 of the Cotton Textiles (Control of Movement) Order, 1948 I hereby direct that the following further amendment shall be made in the General Permit No. 1, dated the 13th August 1949 contained in the Textile Commissioner's Notification No. 15/Tex.1/49, dated 13th August 1949, namely:—

In the said General Permit in paragraph 2 for the figure and letters “20 lbs.” the figure and letters “40 lbs.” shall be substituted.

[No. TCSIV/CTM/47.]

M. R. KAZIMI,

Joint Textile Commissioner.

S. A. TECKCHANDANI, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 22nd November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1920.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, 1946 (XXIV of 1946), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948, namely:—

In clause 28 of the said Order—

(1) sub-clause (4) shall be deleted;

(2) in sub-clause (4A) for the figure and letters “20 lbs.” the figure and letters “40 lbs.” shall be substituted.

[No. 9(4)-CT(A)/52-18.]

S. A. TECKCHANDANI, Under Secy.

## MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

(Agriculture)

*New Delhi, the 15th November, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1921.**—Shri Kalidas Sawhney resumed duty as Secretary, Indian Central Cotton Committee on the 1st November 1952 (forenoon), after a leave of 31 days

leave granted to him *vide* this Ministry Notification of even number, dated the 30th September, 1952.

[No. F. 1-52/52-CJ.]

*New Delhi, the 17th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1922.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946 (IX of 1946), the Central Government hereby extends rules 30—35 of the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee Rules, 1947, to all Part C States, the proposal to extend the same to these States having been already published as required by sub-section (1) of the said section.

[No. F.13-13/51-Com.]

J. S. RAJ, Under Secy.

## MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

*New Delhi, the 13th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1923.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of Section 6 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Act XXXVII of 1952), the Central Government hereby directs that the film entitled 'Shin Shinaki Boobla Boo' in respect of which "U" certificate No. 5671, dated the 8th May, 1952 was granted by the Central Board of Film Censors to Messrs. India Film Exchange, Bombay, shall be deemed to be an uncertified film in the whole of India.

[No. 4(11)/52-F.II.]

C. B. RAO, Joint Secy.

## MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

Office of the Chief Claims Commissioner

*Delhi, the 12th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1924.**—In the Gazette Notification No. 7(49)/CCC/AE-51, dated the September 1952, 6th October 1952 "Jhelum" Distt. against Sl. No. 6, column No. 4 add District 'Jhelum'.

[No. 7(49)/CCC/AE-51.]

I. M. LALL,  
Chief Claims Commissioner.

## MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(Posts and Telegraphs)

*New Delhi, the 13th November, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1925.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (5) of rule 452 of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1932, the Central Government is pleased to direct that, with effect from the 16th December 1952, the Message Rate System shall be introduced at Trivandrum.

[No. PHA-48-4/52.]

K. V. VENKATACHALAM, Dy. Secy.

*New Delhi, the 12th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1926.**—The following draft of a further amendment to the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937, which it is proposed to make in exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Indian Aircraft Act, 1934 (XXII of 1934), is published as required by section 14 of the said Act, for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby, and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken

into consideration on or after the 28th February 1953 Any objection or suggestion which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date specified will be considered by the Central Government

*Draft Amendment*

For rule 13A of the said Rules the following shall be substituted

"13A Carriage of photographic apparatus, etc, in aircraft—

(1) No camera or other apparatus for recording photographic impression or any film or other sensitised plate or material, unexposed or , used shall be carried in an aircraft except where—

- (a) the permission specified in rule 13 to take photographs from the aircraft has been granted,
- (b) the camera or other apparatus for recording photographic impressions or film or other sensitised plate or material is kept in the baggage compartment of the aircraft in a metal container or containers so so that it is not accessible to any passenger or member of the crew while the aircraft is in flight

(2) Any customs officer, any aerodrome officer and any other person specially authorised in this behalf by the Director-General may search any aircraft or any person therein and may without prejudice to any other remedy seal any camera or other apparatus for recording photographic impressions or any film or other sensitised plate or material which, in his opinion is being or is about to be carried in an aircraft in contravention of sub-rule (1) and no person shall tamper with any such seal until the camera apparatus, film, sensitised plate or material is removed from the aircraft

[No 10-A/65-52 ]

P K ROY, Dy Secy

## MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

### MERCHANT SHIPPING

*New Delhi the 12th November, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1927.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1A of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act 1923 (XXI of 1923) the Central Government hereby directs that the following amendment shall be made in the Indian Merchant Shipping (Medical Examination) Rules 1951, namely

For the table annexed to rule 2 of the said Rules, the following table shall be substituted namely

TABLE

1	2
Categories of seamen	Conditions
Deck Officers and Engineers, Radio Officers, Messengers and clerical staff, Stewardesses	If they produce evidence to the satisfaction of the Shipping Master that they are in good health and fit to perform their duties satisfactorily
Medical Officers and their staff, Apprentices and cadets, Hair Dressers, Stewardesses on passenger ships, Electricians, Chinese Carpenters, Fitters, etc, Messengers Wiremen	
Hotel staff including Bazarmen	If they produce evidence to the satisfaction of the Shipping Master of their being in good health

[No 139-MS(1)/51 ]

S K GHOSH, Dy Secy

## PORTS

*New Delhi, the 13th November, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1928.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Indian Ports Act, 1908 (XV of 1908) the Central Government is pleased to authorise Shri V R Ketkar a temporary pilot of the Bombay Port Trust, to pilot vessels in the Port of Bombay

[No 8-P I(187)/52]

S N CHIB, Dy Secy

## PORTS

*New Delhi, the 15th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1929.**—The following draft of an amendment to the Kandla Port Rules, 1950, which is proposed to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Indian Ports Act, 1908 (XV of 1908), is published, as required by sub-section (2) of the said section, for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby and notice is hereby given that the draft will be taken into consideration on or after 1952.

Any objection or suggestion which may be received from any person in respect of the said draft before the date specified will be considered by the Central Government

*Draft Amendment*

For rule 5 of the said Rules the following rule shall be substituted, namely —

- 5 *Vessel entering or leaving or being moved in Port*—No vessel of the measurement of two hundred tons or upwards shall enter, leave or be moved in the Port without having a pilot, Assistant Conservator or assistant of the Deputy Conservator or Assistant Conservator on board and no mechanically propelled vessel of any measurement less than two hundred tons and no other vessel of any measurement less than two hundred tons and exceeding one hundred tons shall enter, leave or be moved in the Port without having a pilot Assistant Conservator or assistant of the Deputy Conservator or Assistant Conservator on board, unless authority in writing so to do has been obtained from the Conservator or some officer empowered by him to give such authority”

[No 3-PII(89)/52]

T S PARASURAMAN, Dy Secy

## MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY

*New Delhi, the 12th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1930.**—The following draft of certain further amendments in the Explosives Rules, 1940, which it is proposed to make in exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Indian Explosives Act, 1884 (IV of 1884), is published as required by Section 18 of the said Act for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th December, 1952

Any objection or suggestion, which may be received from any person in respect of the said draft before the date specified will be considered by the Central Government

*Draft Amendment*

Rule 109 of the said Rules shall be omitted

[No M-103(6)/52]



*New Delhi, the 15th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1931.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Petroleum Act, 1934 (XXX of 1934), and in supersession of the notification, of the Government of India in the late Department of Labour, No. E.104, dated the 26th October 1944, the Central Government hereby directs that in the Schedule annexed to the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Mines and Power No. P.102, dated the 5th May, 1948, after item 14 the following item shall be added, namely:—

“15. The Chemical Assistant, Custom House, Okha.”

[No. M-104(8)/52.]

B. S. KALKAT, Under Secy.

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR

*New Delhi, the 13th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1932.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes) in respect of an application under Section 33-A of the said Act preferred by Shri Pyare Lal of the Punjab Co-operative Bank Limited.

### AWARD

#### BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES), BOMBAY

COMPLAINT NO. 76/52 UNDER SECTION 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947  
Shri Pyare Lal

*Versus*

The Punjab Co-operative Bank Limited.

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by an employee of the above Bank.

The allegations in the complaint are as follows:—

The employee was selected as a representative of bank employees by The Punjab Bank Employees' Federation to attend the proceedings of the Tribunal at Bombay. The Tribunal by its order dated 12th May 1952 directed all the Banks, in which an authorised representative was working, to pay halting and travelling allowances and to relieve the representative so that he may attend the proceedings at Bombay. The Punjab Co-operative Bank agreed to relieve this employee by its letter dated 10th July 1952 but would not pay him the allowances. By a subsequent order of the Tribunal the Bank was directed to pay the allowances. The Bank would not pay the allowances even then. Not content with this unfair labour practice and victimization of the employee the Bank committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 by withholding the salary of the employee from 1st July 1952. This action of the Bank is illegal and it amounts to punishment and also to unfair labour practice intended to victimize the employee for his trade union activities. The Bank must be directed to pay his salary and to stop its unfair labour practice.

The Bank has filed its reply in which it submits that the allowances have already been paid, that the delay in payment of the salary was due to failure on the part of the employee to furnish the Bank with the usual certificates for attendance and that the salary was actually paid on 4th October 1952 “under protest”.

When the complaint was called on 25th October 1952 the employee who was present in person submitted that he was not pressing the complaint as his salary had been paid to him though under protest. He also filed a letter to this effect and it runs as follows:—

“I have to bring to Your Lordships' notice that my salary for the month of July, August and September which was withheld by the Bank has now been released (however under protest) but the allowances I will therefore request Your Lordships to treat the complaint as not

pressed for the present. However, I would further request Your Lordships to take a serious view of the attitude of the Bank for its unfair labour practice”.

The employee has now been paid his salary and it is needless to investigate the allegations relating to unfair labour practice. In these circumstances we pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman*.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member*.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member*.

BOMBAY;

The 3rd November, 1952.

[No. LR-100(18).]

New Delhi, the 14th November, 1952

**S.R.O. 1933.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes), in a dispute between the Indian Overseas Bank Limited and its workmen

#### AWARD

BEFORE THE ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (BANK DISPUTES),

BOMBAY

SERIAL NO. 255. IN REFERENCE NO. 2/52.—(S.R.O. No. 42, DATED 8TH JANUARY 1952)

Shri S. Ayyaswamy

*Versus.*

The Indian Overseas Bank Ltd.

This is one of the disputes referred to us under Ministry of Labour Notification S.R.O. No. 42, dated 8th January 1952. It appears in the schedule as Serial No. 255 and the nature of the dispute as set out therein is as follows:

“Withholding of increment”.

Notice was issued by registered post to the workman on 14th February 1952 calling upon him to file a statement of his case on or before 29th February 1952. The notice was returned to us unserved with the endorsement “left”. Thereafter, fresh notice was issued to the workman by registered post on 10th June 1952 both to the workman's previous address as well as to the new address which was furnished by the Bank. Therein, the workman was called upon to file a statement of his case on or before 26th June 1952. The notice that was issued to the address furnished by the Bank was served on the workman on 18th June 1952. The workman has not filed any statement so far before us.

In these circumstances, there is now no dispute to be decided. We, therefore, pass an award that no orders are necessary.

(Sd.) S. PANCHAPAGESA SASTRY, *Chairman*.

(Sd.) M. L. TANNAN, *Member*.

(Sd.) V. L. D'SOUZA, *Member*

BOMBAY;

The 27th October, 1952.

[No. LR-100(30).]

New Delhi, the 18th November 1952

**S.R.O. 1934.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the members of the Master Stevedores Association, Calcutta, and their workmen.

## CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

20/1 Gurusaday Road, Ballygunge, Calcutta-19.

Before Shri K. S. Campbell-Puri, B.A., LL.B., Chairman

Reference No. 7 of 1951.

## PARTIES

The members of the Master Stevedores' Association, Calcutta (specified in Schedule I of the Ministry of Labour Notification No. LR-3(165), dated 28th July 1951)

And

Their workmen

## APPEARANCES:

Shri K. C. Mukherjee, President, with Mr. Brown, Secretary, and Mr. P. E. Davis, Vice-President, for the Master Stevedores' Association, Calcutta.

Shri Biswanath Dubey, General Secretary, assisted by Shri Sisir Roy, Vice-President, for the Dock Mazdoor Union.

## AWARD

By Notification No. LR 3(165), dated 27th June 1951, Government of India in the Ministry of Labour referred a dispute arisen between the members of the Master Stevedores Association, Calcutta and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in Schedule No II to this Tribunal for adjudication. An amended Notification sometime after was also received and published in the *Gazette of India*, dated 4th August 1951. Usual notices were issued to the parties first on the receipt of the original order of reference and subsequently after the amended order in continuation of the previous notice. The parties were summoned to a preliminary hearing on 5th November 1951 but it was found that the pleadings were not complete. Both sides refused to take the responsibility of having moved for this Reference, and wanted to know the interpretation put by the other side on the issues referred for adjudication and *vice versa*. As the hearing could not proceed further for want of complete pleadings the Dock Mazdoor Union was called upon to submit their full statement of claim in the first instance with a copy to the other side and the Employer was directed to file an amplified statement thereafter, within a fortnight's time. The direction however was not complied with and after more than one extensions having been granted for the completion of pleadings the case became ripe for final hearing by February 1952. In the adjustment of work the parties were actually called for 30th May 1952 for recording evidence if any as well as arguments. But it so transpired that the Employers filed an application on the ground that owing to changed circumstances it had become necessary to approach the Ministry for an amended Reference whereby some more points were to be added for adjudication. The representative of the Dock Mazdoor Union also asked for adjournment and the case was adjourned *sine die*. The Employers however did not inform the Tribunal with regard to the result of their move for the amendment of the Reference and a detailed order, dated 8th October 1952 was placed in the Diary. The same is reproduced in order to give an idea into the undue delay and prolongation in the disposal of this short Reference.

## DIARY ORDER:

"28th October 1952—The hearing in this case has been needlessly delayed, I should say, on account of the non-chalance if not deliberate avoidance of both sides from proceeding with the case. The parties were called to a preliminary hearing about a year back in November 1951 and both sides were not prepared to take the responsibility of having moved the Ministry for referring the dispute for adjudication. The pleadings were found incomplete and the Tribunal discerned that both wanted first to see the interpretation put by the other side on the issues. More time was given and after several extensions ultimately the pleadings were completed and the parties were summoned for final hearing. This time the employers applied for adjournment again on the plea that some amendment was required in the Notification of Reference and they wanted to move the Ministry. The Union representative also wanted adjournment and I was constrained to adjourn the case. The case was adjourned on 8th October 1952; and the case has been put up now after Delhi tour and Pujah holidays.

I have heard the representatives of both sides on the subject and find that there is a move for amicable settlement between the parties. I would rather encourage that but cannot brook any more delay. In case the negotiations do not materialize

into any settlement a week's time would be sufficient for the preparation of arguments because the question is one of interpretation of an agreement made up on 16th October 1952 for arguments

SD K S CAMPBELL-PUR  
Chairman

At this stage there was some talk of settlement between the parties and the negotiations actually ensued in this connection but the same did not materialize and no settlement was arrived at. At long last the case was heard in the first week of November and inspection of the spot was also made in order to appreciate the evidence relied upon and follow certain technical terms used in the course of discussion on the issues in question.

Coming to the Points of dispute it may be stated at the outset that the adjudication on these points embodied in Schedule II merely relates to the interpretation of the decisions of the Expert Committee appointed by agreement between the parties in respect of the number of gangs to be employed per hook. It is significant to note that the parties in their pleadings touched various other aspects of the dispute relating to which do not exactly form the subject of issues referred to. The ... both sides however confined themselves to the question of interpretation only in the course of proceedings, referring of course to the agreement under which the Expert Committee was appointed to give decisions in respect of the number of gangs to be employed per hook. It is also noteworthy that according to the terms of the agreement dated 31st January 1951 it was agreed that the Government of India be requested to take necessary steps for the early formation of a Dock Labour Board and all other items for consideration be kept in abeyance till the creation of the Dock Labour Board. It was furthermore laid down in the aforesaid agreement that the decisions of the Expert Committee or of a majority of the members of the Committee shall be accepted as final and binding on both parties until modified by the Dock Labour Board which was to be set up under the decasualization scheme. I was told that the Dock Labour Board has since been set up. The parties asked for three weeks further extension to move the Dock Labour Board and the same was granted by order dated 16th October 1952, but no useful purpose was served and as said above the case was duly heard and adjudication must follow.

Point No. 11 — A minimum of one gang per hook per single sling up to but not including one ton

Now it will be seen that Point No (1) is couched in a few words so laconically that it has given the decision of Expert Committee the shape of a legal formula. The word 'including' used in it, has been the subject of discussion in some cases before various High Courts, wherein it was held that the meaning of the word 'including' where the interpretation clause says that certain things are included in a term, the term does include unless the context otherwise requires according to its natural import. The connotation of the word 'including' to my mind moreover is generally used in interpretation clause in order to enlarge the meaning of words or phrases occurring in the body and when it is so used these words must be construed as comprehending not only such thing as they signify it according to their natural import but also things which the interpretation clause declares that they shall include. The converse case would have the same connotation i.e. when the words or the term 'not including' is used it does exclude what is meant to be excluded. Put in other words when in an interpretation clause it is stated that a certain weight say 'one ton' is not included it is implied that the term retains its original meaning whatever else it may mean. Judged in this principle enunciated in the law of interpretation the issue may well be divided into three parts:

- (1) a minimum of one gang per hook per single sling up to one ton
- (2) exactly one ton
- (3) beyond one ton and less than one and a half ton.

he parties stand on uncontroverted ground so far parts (1) and (3) are concerned. Mr Biswanath Dubey the recognized representative of the Dock Mazdoor Union while putting the interpretation on Issue No (1) admitted that if the load is less than one ton one gang would only be required and if the load is more than one ton and less than one and a half ton one and a half gang would be necessary if the load is more than one and a half ton then two gangs will be called in. He however intended that the load per gang on different types of cargo fixed throughout a gang practice should neither be increased nor decreased to make it one ton, 1½ ton less than a ton. It was illustrated by referring to the practice whereby six bales of jute or 12 bags of grain are normally put in one sling and these 12 bags or six bales have a particular weight which comes to be maintained. It was maintained that in that case one and one-half gang must be employed per 12 bags.

bags should not be reduced to eleven or ten and thereby by-pass the employment of half gang. It was concluded that mere decrease in weight affects the complement of labour by reduction of half gang and it amounts to sweating of labour. Similarly, it was argued that if one or two bags are added it increase the workload of labour. Shri Dubey also referred to the decision of 31st January 1951—Item 2(a) wherein the words 'according to practice and standards prevailing prior to the development of the present situation are mentioned and urged that these words have their own evidential value because the hooks and slings in respect of their loads have a fixed weight as per practice for different types of cargo either in bags or in bales or tubs etc.

Mr P. E. Davis arguing on behalf of the employers urged that the interpretation to be put on Point No. (1) was simple inasmuch as the finding of the Expert Committee is that one gang should handle cargo up to the weight of one ton per hook meaning thereby that the said sling could weigh 2239 lbs. He proceeded that if the Employers want to put less in the sling they are perfectly entitled to do so provided one gang for the purpose is employed. In other words the position of the Employer is that so long the weight is within one ton one gang would be employed, when it goes beyond one ton then one and a half gang should be employed with the option of the Employers to increase the weight or load up to one and one half ton. Mr Davis admits that when it is beyond  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ton then two gangs would be employed.

On these premises it is abundantly clear that the dispute centres round the weight when it is exactly one ton. The position of the labour is that according to the decision of the Expert Committee as well as the previous practice which is referred to in Part 2(a) of the agreement when the labour has to handle one ton cargo it would be necessary for the Employers to employ  $1\frac{1}{2}$  gang and he should have no option of adding to the weight of its own accord. The stand taken up by the Employers as discussed above is that in the case that one ton cargo is to be handled then the Employers would reserve the right to increase the load up to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ton and employ  $1\frac{1}{2}$  gang for the purpose of handling this cargo. Reliance was placed on the interpretation clauses under the heading absurdity given in Maxwell's Interpretation of Statutes under section 2—pages 3 and 5.

Now it is an established principle of law that Courts should proceed on the assumption that legislature does not make mistakes. Here the Expert Committee whose decision is to be interpreted is presumed not to have made any mistake while giving their decisions. When they used the words 'not including one ton' to my mind it definitely meant that when the weight touches one ton one-half of the gang would be called in to join the one gang or when one ton cargo is to be handled  $1\frac{1}{2}$  gang shall be employed straightly. On the perusal of the agreement also it seems clear that the dispute referred to the Expert Committee was only to determine the number of gang to be employed per hook. If any option or discretion was left with the Employers it should have been made clear specifically that they would be entitled to add to the weight of cargo when one and a half gang was to be employed. It is understandable and I am conscious of it that when nine men of one gang can handle cargo say a pound less than one ton why one and a half gang should not handle one and a half ton which is in the interest of production and that no waste of labour be allowed. But it appears that this was the very dispute between the parties viz., that the labour wanted to avoid sweating of labour and the Employers wanted more production or any more work to be done by the labour. The Expert Committee gave a decision that one gang was to be employed only when the load is less than one ton. No sooner the load to be handled is one ton or more than one ton the complement of labour would be one and a half gang. Now in case it is left to Employers as urged by their representative that they can add to the load when one and a half gang is employed then where was the need of including the words 'not including one ton'. It is a so-called admitted principle of law that no word used in the statute is redundant and as such the use of the words 'not including one ton' has significance of its own and must stand on its own merits. This interpretation is supported also by the practice going on upon which must stress was laid by Shri Dubey. The Expert Committee was appointed under an agreement and the preamble used in the agreement necessarily shall be a guide for the determination of the points referred to the Expert Committee. I would accordingly decide this issue in favour of the labour, with the result that in case the load is exactly one ton,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  gang shall be employed.

Point No. (2)—Single slings of bag cargo should consist of not less than 12 bags and loading of labour should be done on the weight basis the minimum of 2 gangs being booked when double slings are worked.

This point did not provoke much discussion because the parties agreed that when double slings are used two gangs must be booked. It was also not disputed that single slings of bag cargo should consist of not less than 12 and the booking of labour should be done on the weight basis. The dispute rather relates to the implication arising out of it. Shri Dubey putting his interpretation on Point No. (2) urged that this item has a background viz. that there was a specific dispute over the decrease of the weight and consequently it was discussed and decided that weight should not be decreased from 12 bags. That the interpretation now put by the Employers that it could go up i.e. beyond 12 bags is undoubtedly not specified in the specific directions of the Expert Committee embodied in Point No. (2) but the same is regulated or is to be regulated in the light of Clause 2(a) of the agreement viz. according to the practice and standard prevailing.

Mr. Davis in reply on behalf of the Employers argued that the interpretation on this point on the side of Employers is that a single sling of bag cargo with reference to food grains should not consist of less than 12 bags and the labour should be employed on the weight basis, and that it would be in the discretion of the Employers to add bags more than 12 and adjust the labour complement with the weight of that cargo. Replying to the other arguments regarding agreement clause the Association representative submitted that there has been no common standard or practice in this respect in the port of Calcutta.

Now in the light of the finding given on Point No. (1) even if the number of bags be increased the complement of labour shall be governed by the rule laid down in point No. (1) and as such it would be of no consequence; so long the number of bags per single sling is not less than 12 bags and minimum of two gangs are booked when double slings are worked. I hold accordingly.

*Point No. (3).*—When gangs are booked to handle cargoes which are likely to adversely affect the human system, it is recommended that relief gangs should be booked.

The position of the Labour Union of this point is that although the word 'recommended' is used the unanimous recommendation of the Expert Committee set up under the agreement amounts to a decision of the Committee and as such it should be binding upon the Employers to afford relief gangs when the labour has to handle cargo consisting of sulphur, cement, acids, caustic soda, etc. which is likely to affect adversely in human system. The Employer's objection in the first instance was that the finding of the Expert Committee was *ultra vires* and they had no power to recommend any such procedure. Secondly, it was contended that the recommendation was only directory and no mandatory. It was stressed that the number of commodities was so numerous that it was difficult to have any standard. Reference was made to document No. 5 annexed with the written statement.

Now on the question of interpretation it is well recognised that when the terms of any statute are not imperative but only permissive the fair inference would be that it was intended that the use of the powers thereby conferred should be exercised as discretion and in conformity with private rights. The Expert Committee has expressly used the word 'recommended' and in view of the principles and rules of construction discussed above it proves that the Expert Committee was conscious of the difficulty which would come in the way if the labour at every step raises the objection that such and such commodity whose list cannot be made exhaustive is likely to affect the human system. Recommendation was therefore made for relief gangs only when it be actually found so. It follows that it would be at the discretion, of course not arbitrary or capricious, of the Employers to employ relief gangs when any such situation arises i.e. when a cargo of some fumiferous nature is to be handled. In the result the issue is decided against the labour and the interpretation put by the Employers that the decision is of recommendatory nature and not of imperative one is upheld. The other objection of the Employers that the Expert Committee had no power to recommend or the finding was *ultra vires* is devoid of any substance and the same is repelled.

NOW THEREFORE THIS TRIBUNAL MAKES ITS AWARD IN TERMS  
AFORESAID THIS THE 8TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 1952.

K. S. CAMPBELL-PURI, *Chairman,*

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta.

[No. LR-3(165)]

## ORDER

*New Delhi, the 14th November, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1935.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Punjab National Bank Limited and its workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed:

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal at Calcutta constituted under section 7 of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the termination of the services of Messrs. A. N. Mica, Raja Ram Agrawal, Salya Narain, Khem Singh, Anand Prakash, Ram Balash and Ram Bajrai from the Sitapur and Moradabad Branches of the Punjab National Bank Limited on or about the 22nd June 1951, was justified and, if not:—

(i) whether they should be reinstated and, if so, whether they should be paid any wages or allowances from the date of termination of their service to the date of reinstatement; or

(ii) whether they should be given any compensation in lieu of reinstatement.

[No. LR-100(47).]

P. S. EASWARAN, Under Secy,

*New Delhi, the 13th November, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1936.**—*Corrigendum.*—In this Ministry's Notification No. S.R.O. 1705, dated the 4th October, 1952, published on page 1530-1537 of the *Gazette of India* Part II—Section 3, dated the 11th October, 1952, for the words "this Scheme shall come into force" occurring in sub-paragraph 3 of paragraph 1 read the words "this Scheme shall be deemed to have come into force".

[No. PF 23(5)/52.]

N. M. PATNAIK, Dy. Secy.

*New Delhi, the 14th November, 1952*

**S.R.O. 1937.**—*Corrigendum.*—In the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.R.O. 246, dated the 30th January 1952, published on page 270 of Part II, Section 3 of the *Gazette of India*, dated the 9th February 1952, for the word and figure "rule 4", read the word and figure "rule 3".

[No. M-23(8)/52.]

*New Delhi, the 14th November 1952*

**S.R.O. 1938.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1946 (XXII of 1946) read with clause (a) of sub-rule (4) of rule 3 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1948, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Surya Mal Mauraya, Member, Ajmer, Legislative Assembly, as a member of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee for the State of Ajmer constituted under the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.R.O. 248, dated the 30th January 1952.

[No. M-23(8)52.]

**S.R.O. 1939.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1946 (XXII of 1946) read with clause (b) of sub-rule (4) of rule 3 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1948 the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Onkar Nath Sharma, Labour Officer, Ajmer, as the Vice-Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Mica Mines Labour

Welfare Fund for the State of Ajmer, constituted under the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.R.O. 218, dated the 30th January 1952.

[No. M-23(8)52]

P. N. SIIARMA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 15th November 1952

**S.R.O. 1940.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 16 of the Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Act, 1932 (XXII of 1932), the Central Government hereby declares that, with effect from the 1st February, 1953, the areas comprising the former Indian States of Rampur and Tehri Garhwal now formed as Rampur and Tehri Garhwal districts, respectively, and the areas comprising the former Indian State of Banaras now included in the district of Banaras, in the State of Uttar Pradesh, shall be controlled emigration areas

[AL.145/EMG(12)I]

**S.R.O. 1941.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Act, 1932 (XXII of 1932), the Central Government hereby empowers the District Magistrates, Tehri Garhwal, Rampur and Banaras in the State of Uttar Pradesh respectively, to grant license to any person to act as a local forwarding agent in the controlled emigration areas comprising the former Indian States of Tehri Garhwal, Rampur and Banaras in the State of Uttar Pradesh, on behalf of an employer or employers of labourers

[AL.145/EMG(12)II]

**S.R.O. 1942.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 36 of the Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Act, 1932 (XXII of 1932), the Central Government hereby invests the District Magistrates of Tehri Garhwal, Rampur and Banaras in the State of Uttar Pradesh, with the powers of the Controller under sub-clauses (iv) and (v) of clause (a) and clauses (b), (c) and (d) of section 4 and under section 33, 34 and 35 of the said Act to be exercised respectively within the areas comprising the former Indian States of Tehri Garhwal, Rampur and Banaras.

[AL.145/EMG(12)III]

**S.R.O. 1943.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 36 of the Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Act, 1932 (XXII of 1932), the Central Government hereby invests the Civil Surgeons of the Tehri Garhwal, Rampur and Banaras districts with the powers of the Controller under sub-section (1) of section 33 and sub-section (1) of section 35 of the said Act, to be exercised respectively within the areas comprising the former Indian States of Tehri-Garhwal, Rampur and Banaras, in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

[AL.145/EMG(12)IV]

New Delhi, the 18th November 1952

**S.R.O. 1944.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 14 read with section 24 of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 (IV of 1936), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, No. S.R.O. 663, dated the 4th April 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints the undermentioned officers to be Inspectors for the purposes of the said Act in respect of persons employed in any mine, to whom the said Act applies, within the local limits noted against each:—

- |                                                                                                                              |   |                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The Chief Labour Commissioner (Central).                                                                                  | } | Whole of India except the State of Jammu and Kashmir.                                                                       |
| 2. The Welfare Adviser to the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central).                                                           |   |                                                                                                                             |
| 3. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Ajmer.                                                                        | } | The States of Punjab, Patiala and East Punjab States Union, Rajasthan, Madhya Bharat, Ajmer, Himachal Pradesh and Bilaspur. |
| 4. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Ajmer.                                                                                |   |                                                                                                                             |
| 5. The Labour Inspectors (Central), Ajmer Region with headquarters at Ferozepur, Ambala, Ajmer, Jodhpur, Bhilwara and Ratlam |   |                                                                                                                             |



6. The Regional Labour Commissioner, (Central), Bombay.	The States of Bombay, Saurashtra and Kutch.
7. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Bombay.	
8. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Poona.	
9. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Rajkot.	
10. The Labour Inspectors (Central), Bombay Region, with headquarters at Rajkot, Bombay I, Bombay II, Bombay III, Poona, Ahmedabad, Bhusawal and Hubli.	
11. The Regional Labour Commissioner, (Central), Calcutta.	The States of West Bengal, Assam, Manipur and Tripura.
12. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Calcutta I.	
13. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Calcutta II.	
14. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Gauhati.	
15. The Labour Inspectors (Central), Calcutta Region, with headquarters at Calcutta I, Calcutta II, Gauhati, Kharagpur, Dibrugarh and Calcutta III.	
16. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Dhanbad.	The States of Bihar, West Bengal (coal mines only), Orissa and Vindhya Pradesh.
17. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Cuttack.	
18. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Dhanbad.	
19. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Asansol.	
20. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Patna.	
21. The Labour Inspectors (Central), Dhanbad Region, with headquarters at Asansol, Bermo, Patna, Jharla, Katrasgarh, Kodarma, Muzaffarpur, Giridih, Cuttack and Rewa.	
22. The Junior Labour Inspectors (Central), Dhanbad Region.	
23. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Madras.	The States of Madras, Mysore, Travancore-Cochin and Coorg.
24. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Madras.	
25. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Madura.	
26. The Labour Inspectors (Central), Madras Region, with headquarters at Madras I Bezvada, Vizagapatnam, Coimbatore, Cochin, Trivandrum, Madras II Bangalore and Kolar (Gold Fields).	
27. The Regional Labour Commissioner, (Central), Kanpur.	The States of Uttar Pradesh and Delhi.
28. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Kanpur.	
29. The Conciliation Officer (Central), New Delhi.	
30. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Allahabad.	
31. The Labour Inspectors (Central), Kanpur Region, with headquarters at Delhi I, Delhi II, Gorakpur, Bareilly, Lucknow, Allahabad and Kanpur.	
32. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Nagpur.	The States of Madhya Pradesh, Hyderabad and Bhopal.
33. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Nagpur.	
34. The Conciliation Officer (Central), Secunderabad.	
35. The Labour Inspectors (Central), Nagpur Region, with headquarters at Parasia, Jubbulporc, Nagpur, Raipur, Secunderabad and Kathgodum.	
36. The Junior Labour Inspectors (Central), Nagpur Region.	

[No. Fac. 103(9)]

SADASHIVA PRASAD, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 17th November 1952

**S.R.O. 1945.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 38 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendments shall be made in the Industrial Disputes

(Central) Rules, 1947, the same having been previously published as required by sub-section (1) of the said section, namely:—

### Amendments

#### In the said Rules—

1. After rule 51A, the following rule shall be inserted, namely:—

51B. *Application for permission under section 33.*—(1) An employer intending to obtain the express permission in writing of the conciliation officer, Board or Tribunal, as the case may be, under section 33 shall present an application in Form DDI in triplicate to such conciliation officer, Board or Tribunal and shall file along with the application as many copies thereof as there are opposite parties.

(2) Every application under sub-rule (1) shall be verified at the foot by the employer making it or by some other person proved to the satisfaction of the conciliation officer, Board or Tribunal to be acquainted with the facts of the case.

(3) The person verifying shall specify, by reference to the numbered paragraphs of the application, what he verifies of his own knowledge and what he verifies upon information received and believed to be true.

(4) The verification shall be signed by the person making it and shall state the date on which and the place at which it was verified."

2. In the Schedule after Form DD the following Form shall be inserted, namely:—

#### FORM DDI

(See Rule 51B)

Before (here mention the conciliation officer, Board or Tribunal)

Application for permission under section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947)

A ..... Applicant

Address:—

#### Versus

B ..... Opposite Party(ies)

Address(es):—

The abovementioned applicant begs to state as follows:—

(here set out the relevant facts and circumstances of the case and the grounds on which the permission is sought for)

The applicant therefore prays that the express permission may kindly be granted to him to take the following action, namely:—

(here mention the action specified in clause (a) or clause (b) of section 33)

Signature of the applicant.

Dated this..... day of ..... 195 ..

Space for verification

(Signature of the person verifying)

Date (on which the verification was signed) .. .. .

Place (at which the verification was signed) .. .. .

[No. LR.1(194)]

S. V. JOSHI, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 18th November 1952

S.R.O. 1946.—In pursuance of sub-section (4) of section 11 of the War Injuries (Compensation Insurance) Act, 1943 (XXIII of 1943), and rule 7 of the War Injuries Compensation Insurance Rules, 1943, the Central Government hereby publishes

the following account of the War Injuries Compensation Insurance Fund during the six months ending the 30th June 1952:—

Account of sums received into and paid out of the War Injuries Compensation Insurance Fund during the six months ending the 30th June 1952.

Particulars	Receipts		Particulars	Expenditure		
	Amount	Progress of receipts up to the end of June, 1952		Amount	Progress of expenditure upto the end of June, 1952	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
	Rs.	Rs. As. Ps.			Rs.	As. Ps.
Advances of premium	..	6,86,841 13 8	(i) Compensation under War Injuries Compensation Insurance Scheme	..	13,377	9 0
Advances from General Revenues under Section 11(2)	..	..	(ii) Remuneration of expenses of Govt. Agents.	..	65,592	9 6
Miscellaneous	..	..	(iii) Expenses of the staff employed to do work in the Provinces and at the Headquarters of the Central Government.	..	1,33,770	8 6
		..	(iv) Expenses of the additional staff required to cope with the audit and accounting arrangements.	..	15,515	5 7
		..	(v) Miscellaneous	..	11,515	10 6
Total	Nil	6,86,841 13 8	Total	Nil	2,39,771	11 1

[No. SS 142(18).]

K. N. NAMBIAR. Under Secy.

